

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-identified patent application has been amended and reconsideration and re-examination are hereby requested.

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U. S. C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,691,191).

It is first noted that in the present invention, it is the bus arbiter that grants access to the bus in response to the **BUS ARBITER** determining whether one of the clients requesting access to the bus has experienced an "address retry" condition during its previous bus access. With Kobayashi et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,691,191) it is the clients that do the "suppression" referred to by the Examiner.

Thus, referring to the claims, claim 3 points out that a bus arbiter coupled to the bus, such bus arbiter granting access to the bus in response to **such bus arbiter determining whether one of the clients requesting access to the bus has experienced an "address retry" condition during its previous bus access,** and if so, the arbiter granting such one of the requesting clients priority access to the bus; otherwise, absent previous to an "address retry", condition on the previous bus access, providing bus access to the requesting one, or ones, of the clients based on a criteria independent of "address retry" conditions being induced on the bus. With Kobayashi et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,691,191) the bus control unit 5 does **NOT determine whether one of the clients requesting access to the bus has experienced an "address retry" condition during its previous bus access.**

Claim 4 points out that **such bus arbiter determining whether one of clients requesting access to the bus experienced an induced "address retry" condition during its previous bus access.** With Kobayashi et al. (U. S. Patent No. 6,691,191) the bus control unit 5 does **NOT determine whether one of clients requesting access to the bus experienced an induced "address retry" condition during its previous bus access.**

In the event a petition for extension of time is required by this paper and not otherwise provided, such petition is hereby made and authorization is provided herewith to charge deposit account No. 05-0889 for the cost of such extension.

Application No.: 10/606,819
Reply to Final Rejection of March 2, 2006

In the event any additional fee is required, please charge such amount to Patent and
Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 05-0889.

Respectfully submitted,

May 4, 2006

Date

/richard sharkansky/

Richard M. Sharkansky Reg. No. 25,800,

Attorney for Applicant(s)

P. O. Box 557

Mashpee, MA 02649

Telephone: (508) 477-4311

Facsimile: (508) 477-7234